

The Court should allow the MDL to serve its purpose of conserving judicial resources and avoiding inefficient common liability and expert discovery, duplication of efforts, and inconsistent rulings, and not force plaintiffs to start at square one with judges who have no familiarity with this complicated litigation.

Plaintiffs Brady, Pettit, Montee and Cooper (collectively “Ohio Plaintiffs”) and Plaintiff Overstreet, seek leave to join the Plaintiffs’ Objection to Remand late. At the time of the deadline to file an objection to remand, the Ohio Plaintiffs and Plaintiff Overstreet were contemplating remand and representation by local Ohio and New Jersey lawyers. Given that the representation by local lawyers has not yet been finalized, the Plaintiffs will be significantly prejudiced if these cases are remanded to Ohio and New Jersey without such representation in place. The same applies to the other plaintiffs who previously objected to remand, as current counsel is not barred in Illinois, Minnesota, Ohio or New Jersey.

For the foregoing reasons and the reasons set forth in Plaintiffs’ Objection to Remand (Dkt. 2942), remand is inappropriate at this time and the Ohio Plaintiffs and Plaintiff Overstreet should be permitted to join the Plaintiffs’ Objection to Remand. All of the above-named cases should remain subject to this Honorable Court’s jurisdiction.

Dated: August 23, 2016

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Kimberly A. Dougherty

Kimberly A. Dougherty

JANET, JENNER & SUGGS, LLC

31 St. James Avenue, Suite 365

Boston, MA 02116

Telephone: 617/933-1265

kdougherty@myadvocates.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Kimberly A. Dougherty, hereby certify that on this day 23rd of August, 2016, a copy of the foregoing document was electronically filed. Notice of this filing will be sent to all parties by operation of the Court's electronic filing system. Parties may access this filing through the Court's System.

/s/ Kimberly A. Dougherty
Kimberly A. Dougherty, Esquire